UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

J. DOES 1-26,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ELON MUSK, in his official capacity, UNITED STATES DOGE SERVICE and THE DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 25-0462-TDC

ORDER

Plaintiffs have filed three Motions to Seal and Proceed Under Pseudonyms. ECF Nos. 38, 40, 49. The first two Motions relate to the same three declarations of witnesses J. Roe 1, J. Roe 3, and J. Roe 4. ECF Nos. 38, 40. The third Motion relates to the declarations of witnesses J. Roe 6, J. Roe 7, and J. Roe 8. ECF No. 49.

As to the first two Motions, ECF Nos. 38, 40, Defendants have stated that they do not oppose these Motions. Hrg. Tr. at 5-6, ECF No. 53. Accordingly, these two Motions will be granted.

As to the third Motion, ECF No. 49, Defendants have filed an Opposition to that Motion, ECF No. 62, to which Plaintiffs have filed a Reply, ECF No. 65. Under Local Rule 105.11, a Motion to Seal must include: "(a) proposed reasons supported by specific factual representations to justify the sealing and (b) an explanation why alternatives to sealing would not provide sufficient protection." Upon review of the submitted materials, the Court concludes that Plaintiffs' Third Motion to Seal, ECF No. 49, satisfies these criteria, and thus the Motion will be granted.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- Plaintiffs' Motions to Seal and Proceed Under Pseudonyms, ECF Nos. 38, 40, 49, are GRANTED.
- 2. The declarations of J. Roe 1, J. Roe 3, J. Roe 4, J. Roe 6, J. Roe 7, and J. Roe 8, ECF Nos. 38-1, 38-2, 38-3, 40-1, 40-2, 40-3, 49-1, shall be sealed.

Date: March 21, 2025

THEODORE D. CHUANG United States Distric Judge